

Remarks:

Claims 44-68 remain in the application.

In the Drawings

The box in regards to drawings was checked on office action but not the box indicating they were accepted or not.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner rejected claims 44-47, 51-55, 57-63 and 66-68 under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Roffman, et al. (US patent No. 6,375, 568). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

The present invention, as described in the pending claims, recites a gaming system comprising a first gaming machine and a second gaming machine. The first master gaming controller on the first gaming machine is designed "ii) to determine a first outcome for the first game of chance played on the gaming machine," "iv) to receive a second outcome for a second game of chance played on a second gaming machine wherein the second outcome for the second game of chance is generated on the second gaming machine," and "vi) to send the first outcome to the second gaming machine." The second master gaming controller on the second gaming machine is designed or configured "b) to determine the second outcome for the second game of chance;" "d) to send the second outcome to the first gaming machine," and "e) to receive the first outcome for the first game of chance played on the first gaming machine wherein the first outcome for the first game of chance is generated on the first gaming machine."

In the system of Roffman, a controller 12 using random number generator 28 generates all the outcomes for the gaming machines 14 (see col. 6:50-50). Thus, in Roffman, the gaming machines do not determine outcomes for a game of chance played on the gaming machine. In the present invention, the first gaming machine and the second gaming machine each determine and outcome. This limitation is not taught or suggested in Roffman.

Further, in system of Roffman, the gaming machines 14 do not send outcomes to the controller 12 or to the other gaming machines 14. In the system of Roffman, the gaming machines 14 only receive an outcome from the controller 12. There is no need for the gaming machines 14 to send an outcome to the controller or another gaming machine 14 because all of this information is already at the controller 12. In the present invention, the first master gaming controller on the first gaming machine is designed to "iv) to receive a second outcome for a

Attorney Docket: IGT1P024C1/P-247 CON

second game of chance played on a second gaming machine wherein the second outcome for the second game of chance is generated on the second gaming machine,” and “vi) to send the first outcome to the second gaming machine” and the second master gaming controller is designed to “d) to send the second outcome to the first gaming machine,” and “e) to receive the first outcome for the first game of chance played on the first gaming machine wherein the first outcome for the first game of chance is generated on the first gaming machine.” These limitations are not taught or suggested in the system of Roffman. Therefore for at least these reasons, Roffman can’t be said to anticipate the pending claims and the rejection is believed overcome thereby.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejected claim 48-50, 56 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roffman, et al. in view of Pierce et al (US patent No. 6, 047, 963). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Pierce shows a gaming machine FIG.1 that provides a slot game with a mechanical pachinko bonus game. Each slot machine receives a wager for a slot game and only shows the outcome of the slot game it has generated. The gaming machines in Pierce do not send outcomes to another gaming machine or receive outcomes from another gaming machine. As described above, in the system of Roffman, the gaming machines also do not do not send outcomes to another gaming machine or receive outcomes from another gaming machine. Therefore, the combination of Roffman and Pierce can’t be said to render obvious claims 48-50 and 56 and the rejection is believed overcome thereby.

The Examiner rejected claim 64, 65 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roffman, et al in view of Seelig et al (US patent No. 5, 564, 998). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

In Seelig, the play of slot games on different slot machines is described (see FIG. 3). Each slot machine receives a wager for a slot game and only shows the outcome of the slot game it has generated. The gaming machines in Seelig do not send outcomes to another gaming machine or receive outcomes from another gaming machine. As described above, in the system of Roffman, the gaming machines also do not do not send outcomes to another gaming machine or receive outcomes from another gaming machine. Therefore, the combination of Roffman and Seelig can’t be said to render obvious claims 64 and 65 and the rejection is believed overcome thereby.

If the examiner believes that a telephone conference would aid the prosecution of this case in any way, the examiner is invited to call the undersigned at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP



David P. Olynick
Reg. No.: 48,615

BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP
P.O. Box 70250
Oakland, CA 94612-0250
Telephone (510) 663-1100

Attorney Docket: IGT1P024C1/P-247 CON

-4-